	Case 1:13-cr-10200-GAO Document 1527 Filed 09/25/15 Page 1 of 13	
		1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
5	Plaintiff,) Criminal Action	
6	v.) No. 13-10200-GAO	
7	DZHOKHAR A. TSARNAEV, also) known as Jahar Tsarni,)	
8	Defendant.	
9)	
10		
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE GEORGE A. O'TOOLE, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
12		
13	LOBBY CONFERENCE	
14	SEALED TRANSCRIPT	
15		
16	John J. Moakley United States Courthouse	
17	Courtroom No. 9 One Courthouse Way	
18	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 Tuesday, March 10, 2015	
19	9:15 a.m.	
20	Chonvil Dobletness DMD CDD	
22	Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter	
23	John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse One Courthouse Way, Room 3510 Boston, Massachusetts 02210	
23	(617) 737-8728	
25	Mechanical Steno - Computer-Aided Transcript	
20		

1	APPEARANCES:
2	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY By: William D. Weinreb, Aloke Chakravarty and
3	Nadine Pellegrini, Assistant U.S. Attorneys John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse
4	Suite 9200 Boston, Massachusetts 02210
5	- and - UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
6	By: Steven D. Mellin, Assistant U.S. Attorney Capital Case Section
7	1331 F Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530
8	On Behalf of the Government
9	FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE By: Miriam Conrad and William W. Fick
10	Federal Public Defenders 51 Sleeper Street
11	Fifth Floor Boston, Massachusetts 02210
12	- and - CLARKE & RICE, APC
13	By: Judy Clarke, Esq. 1010 Second Avenue
14	Suite 1800 San Diego, California 92101
15	- and - LAW OFFICE OF DAVID I. BRUCK
16	By: David I. Bruck, Esq. 220 Sydney Lewis Hall
17	Lexington, Virginia 24450 On Behalf of the Defendant
18	On Benair of the Defendant
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 (LOBBY CONFERENCE AS FOLLOWS: THE COURT: Whose turn? 2 MR. WEINREB: I'll start. We just wanted to talk a 3 4 bit about today's schedule. As we mentioned yesterday, we're 5 pretty confident that we will get through the next segment by 6 the end of lunch, and that's the segment -- we'll finish up this part that we've been doing. 7 THE COURT: You mean before lunch, by 1:00? 8 MR. WEINREB: By 1:00, yes. So the witness is on the 9 00:00 10 stand now. There will be a couple other witnesses. And then 11 we'll begin with the segment on the collection of evidence from Boylston Street and the introduction of the exhibits that 12 13 display the evidence. 14 After that, we would begin with the presentation of 1.5 the Sean Collier evidence, and we'd prefer to start that 16 Wednesday morning, if that's possible, because those witnesses 17 were all told to come in Wednesday and Thursday, and they've all adjusted their schedules accordingly. 18 19 THE COURT: Any issue with that? 00:01 20 MS. CLARKE: No. 21 THE COURT: Other than with me?

MR. WEINREB: And then Tuesday afternoon -- this afternoon, if the Court wishes, we can arrange for a viewing of the boat.

MS. CLARKE: No.

22

23

24

```
1
                   THE COURT: Yeah, that sounds good. We'll get to that
          -- at this pace, we'll get to that fairly soon, too.
     2
                   MR. WEINREB: We will.
     3
                   THE COURT: When do you think?
     4
     5
                   MR. WEINREB: We'll get to that?
                   THE COURT: Yeah. The beginning of next week?
     7
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Sometime next week.
                   THE COURT: Okay.
     8
                   MR. WEINREB: Yeah, sometime next week. And then
     9
00:01 10
          we'll start -- we'll do the carjacking and those events
    11
          starting on Thursday, and then we'll move into Watertown.
          that concludes with the arrest of the defendant. So it will be
    12
    13
          Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday of next week, something like that.
    14
                   THE COURT: Just mentioning the cars, any viewing of
    1.5
          the cars?
    16
                   MR. WEINREB: They're all there if the Court wants to
          see them. We don't --
    17
    18
                   THE COURT: I mean, do you intend to offer a view?
    19
                   MR. WEINREB: They were so well-photographed, it seems
00:02 20
          unnecessary. Also, they're not in the same state now that they
    21
          were in. There has been too much manipulation of them, I
    22
          think, to make a view make sense.
    23
                   With respect to the mechanics of the Court going to
    24
          see the boat, what's your preference?
    25
                   THE COURT: I don't know. I just this morning was
```

thinking about that. I guess I would talk to the marshals and see what they can put together. I don't know whether we -- I think they drive me anyway, and maybe others can come in their own cars. That's probably the easiest thing to do.

MR. WEINREB: I think so. So it's in a secure FBI facility. There shouldn't be any security issues there. As long as you have transportation --

THE COURT: I think they do that. I haven't raised it with them, but I'll do that maybe at the midmorning break, see if they can -- actually, we should probably do it beforehand.

That would be with Kevin. I'll have to talk to Kevin.

THE CLERK: Okay. Very good.

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: One point on the boat is we have a witness who is going to describe the fact that there was a writing in the boat before we actually describe the more detailed -- what we want to do is cut out the note and present it. But there will be that testimony today so -- just so it's not -- you're not caught unawares that that's coming.

The other issue we wanted to raise was, the next witness after Mr. Kimball is scheduled to be Chad Fitzgerald, who is the first expert witness. And he is a cell-site location specialist.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah.

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: There was a motion to exclude such Daubert on that. We've opposed it. We think it can be

1.5

00:02 10

00:03 20

resolved on the papers.

1.5

00:04 20

00:04 10

MS. CLARKE: We were given some materials last night that run into the thousands of pages and have not had, obviously, a chance to look at that. So we would ask that the government delay that witness until we have an opportunity to at least look at what they provided us that may or may not be relevant to his --

THE COURT: I thought from the reply that that had ceased to be an issue.

MS. CLARKE: Yes, but they just gave us thousands of pages of documents, and we have no idea what they are. So if we could get the government to delay that witness until we can at least review those documents, that would probably be the best way.

THE COURT: What kinds of documents are they?

MS. CLARKE: I have no idea. We got them last night by email.

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Three sets of phone records, which we had produced before, that relate to the phones that were located, the thousands of pages of documents which you haven't had before, which are the phone companies' locations for the cell towers. So it's literally a list of every cell tower in Massachusetts that was subscribed to by the phone company, and it's that data which he had prepared his report with. And we realized that we didn't actually have that raw data. He gave

me that, and we turned that over.

1

THE COURT: Well, I think they should have a chance to 2 at least look through it. We don't know how much it will be. 3 MS. CLARKE: We don't know what added value it will 4 5 have, but we should look at it. 6 THE COURT: So with respect to the other -- one of the 7 other Daubert motions, as long as we're talking about that, the binding code fellow, is that an issue that we have to resolve? 8 9 MS. CLARKE: We should get Mr. Watkins in to talk about that. That's been one of his areas. 00:05 10 11 THE COURT: Do you know whether it's still a live 12 issue? 13 MS. CLARKE: I would have to talk to him. It just has 14 not been on the table. 15 THE COURT: When would that fellow --16 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Not until the end of the next week, at the earliest, maybe the following --17 THE COURT: So we have time on that. 18 19 MR. WEINREB: Actually, while we're on Daubert motions 00:05 20 -- and this one will come up early next week when we do the 21 Watertown presentation. I want to make sure I understand the 22 Court's ruling about the DNA evidence. And my understanding is 23 that the Court ruled -- excluded the evidence about the DNA on 24 the inside of the gloves on 403 grounds, that it lacked sufficient --25

THE COURT: 402, 403. It wasn't shown to be sufficiently relevant.

MR. WEINREB: Right. And that -- because of the concern the Court stated, which is that there's no way of knowing when the DNA got there --

THE COURT: Right.

00:07 20

00:06 10

MR. WEINREB: So I would assume that would apply equally to the DNA of Tamerlan Tsarnaev on the inside of the gloves.

THE COURT: Yeah, I quess.

MR. WEINREB: All right. So, in other words, the testimony --

THE COURT: In other words -- yeah. I don't know all the details about this, but gloves -- unless there's some way -- some external way to -- external to the DNA, to determine when the DNA may have been deposited on the inside, circumstantial evidence, for example -- I don't know whose gloves they are. If they're Collier's gloves, therefore, the two brothers could only have had access to that night, then you could time it. But if they're their gloves or somebody else's unknown gloves, then the DNA could have been deposited a week before. It would have no relevance to the Collier episode. So that -- I mean, if you can't tell when it may have been deposited either by the DNA analysis or by circumstances that could explain it, it seems to me there's not enough of a

00:08 20

00:07 10

connection. That somebody had worn a glove that was found in the person's car at some time just makes it too remote to connect it to the Collier event.

MR. WEINREB: So with that rationale in mind, unless we hear some other evidence that we haven't heard yet, I assume that that rationale would apply with equal force to the DNA -- all the DNA --

THE COURT: I would think so. And I would think also, offering it, if that's what would happen, would invite the response.

MR. FICK: The issue though, your Honor, was really not -- I mean, the time came into play, but the issue with the glove that was in dispute -- or the DNA that was in dispute really had more to do with the conclusion that you couldn't exclude Tamerlan or Jahar and that, therefore, it really had no probative value in terms of who might have worn the glove on that night or at any other time. It wasn't so much a temporal issue as an issue that it just -- it didn't help you make a distinction that was important in the case.

THE COURT: That's sort of the <u>Daubert</u> argument, but I avoided the <u>Daubert</u> argument by concluding that it wasn't relevant anyway even if you could do that under <u>Daubert</u>. So you don't reach that matter. The motion was not denied as a <u>Daubert</u> matter, or allowed, whatever. The exclusion wasn't based on Daubert. It was based on simple relevance. In other

1 words, my view was we don't need to resolve the Daubert question because the evidence isn't probative enough in the 2 first place. So it doesn't show -- unless there's evidence 3 4 that either of them wore it that night or close to the events 5 to connect the DNA to the presence and participation of that 6 particular depositor, that's my --7 MS. CLARKE: Then Daubert becomes an issue if we open the door with the Tamerlan DNA, which is clearly in one glove. 8 9 THE COURT: I don't know. I quess it would depend on 00:09 10 where your evidence was, but there's certainly that 11 possibility. I reserve judgment until I hear the actual 12 problem. 13 MR. FICK: I just -- the temporal thing really hadn't 14 been our focus. And, I mean, to take it to its logical 15 extreme, of course, the fact that Officer Collier's blood is on 16 the glove, we don't know when that happened. I mean, the 17 obvious inference is it was that evening. 18 THE COURT: I think that's an easier question. 19 MR. FICK: I guess we'll have to think about the 00:09 20 implications of that. 21 THE COURT: Well --22 MR. WEINREB: So the government's position is clear, 23 if the defense is going to offer evidence of Tamerlan's DNA on 24 the inside of the glove as probative of the fact that Tamerlan

was the one who wore the gloves that night and used them in the

murder of Officer Collier, then we believe we should be allowed 1 to put in evidence that Jahar Tsarnaev's DNA is also on the 2 inside --3 4 MS. CLARKE: It is not on the inside of the glove. 5 That's the point. He cannot be excluded as a contributor. MR. WEINREB: No, no. We're talking about the other 6 glove, the one in which the cytogenetics analysis shows that 7 the chances of -- that Jahar's profile is on the glove and that 8 9 the chances of randomly selecting someone from the population 00:10 10 with that same profile is one in 40,000. 11 MR. MELLIN: I think it is fair rebuttal to say that he cannot be excluded in the other one. 12 13 MS. CLARKE: I don't think we should get into this 14 debate right now since Mr. Watkins has been our lead on this. 1.5 THE COURT: I think you understand my position. 16 not resolving the Daubert question because of other relevance concerns. If that changes and we have to resolve it, then we 17 should have enough advance notice of that that we can do that. 18 19 MS. CLARKE: Sure. 00:11 20 MR. MELLIN: Your Honor, can I raise one other issue, 21 which is the 12.2 issue? 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. MELLIN: I don't mean to poke the elephant in the room, but we do need some time to be allowed to have these 24 25 experts do their analysis.

```
1
                   THE COURT: Right. Understood.
     2
                   MS. CLARKE: Judge, Mr. Fick will be the one from our
     3
          team going with you to see the boat just for coordination
     4
          purposes.
     5
                   THE COURT: Okay. All right.
     6
                   MR. WEINREB: We're going to draw straws.
     7
                   THE COURT: The loser goes?
     8
          (Laughter.)
     9
                   MS. CLARKE: This was a winner.
00:11 10
                   MR. WEINREB: We've seen the boat enough.
    11
                   THE COURT: All right.
    12
                   MS. CLARKE: Thank you.
    13
                   THE COURT: Do you need the monitor, the big, clunky
    14
          monitor?
    15
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: We got the message that we should be
    16
          moving it out.
    17
                   THE COURT: It's partly in my way. I can't see all of
    18
          the team here.
    19
                   MS. CLARKE: I want you to keep your eyes on them,
00:11 20
          too.
    21
          (Laughter.)
    22
          . . END OF LOBBY CONFERENCE.)
    23
    24
    25
```

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my skill and ability.

/s/Cheryl Dahlstrom

September 25, 2015

Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR Dated

Official Court Reporter

LJ